

In the Drawings:

Please amend FIG. 3 and FIG. 4 as shown on the attached drawing amendment sheets.

REMARKS.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12 and 14-19 are amended. New claims 21-23 are added herewith

The Examiner objects to the drawings as not being cross-sectionally shaded to indicate plastic. The attached drawing amendment sheet for FIG. 4 is believed to resolve the Examiner's objections. Also, a spurious line portion at the left side of the drawing is removed by the amendment. Regarding the Examiner's question relating to FIG. 3, the referenced width indicators 150 have been extended to touch the base, to clarify to what they relate. Formal drawings incorporating the changes will be filed when the application is allowed.

The Examiner objects to the abstract as including the phrase "is provided". This phrase has been deleted from the abstract to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner alleges that the title is not descriptive. A new title is presented herewith.

Various objections are made to the disclosure by the Examiner. Amendments herewith are intended to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-14 and 16-20, as amended, are believed in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Montoya et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The various claims as amended, include plural mating faceted portions (claim 1) that define the relation between the retention ring and the base. No such relation is taught or suggested by Montoya et al, who show smooth rings. An advantage provided by applicant's invention is that the ring portion moves in discrete steps, and can be rotated to a desired position, where the ring will remain, unless moved by an operator. Montoya's system requires engagement of a locking member to keep the ring from moving. The Montoya et al ring is either locked closed, or else it is free to move.

Applicant also traverses the Examiner's statement that "the retention ring 36 and the groove include beveled surfaces, i.e., the inner surfaces of the groove and the mating outer surfaces of the retention ring 36." The arcuate tubular part 34 and arcuate rod 36 are both curved not beveled, hence Montoya et al's use of the descriptive terms "tubular" and "rod" in the specification. To anticipate a claim, language should be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill

in the art. Accordingly, in light of the above remarks and amendments, claims 1-7 are believed allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Montoya et al, in view of Cole. The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claim 8 as amended recites that the retention ring is adapted to rotate in discrete segmented steps about said base. Claim 15 includes moving in discrete segmented steps. Montoya et al and Cole, whether considered alone, or when combined, do not teach or suggest applicant's segmented steps. Montoya et al have a smooth sliding portion. Cole just shows straps that can be cinched down around a wheel. Applicant's system is an inventive improvement over what is disclosed by these cited documents, and therefore, claims 8-20 are submitted to be allowable.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cole in view of Montoya et al, the Examiner states as his grounds for rejection "the use of the apparatus as set forth above by Cole in view of Montoya et al would inherently lead to the method steps set forth in claims 15-20". Applicant traverses this rejection. As noted above, there is no suggestion or teaching of the segmented movement in the documents relied upon, whether considered alone, or when taken together. The segmented movement is taught by applicant's disclosure, not the prior art. Therefore, claims 15-20 are also submitted to be allowable.

New claims 21-23 are submitted herewith and are also believed allowable.

In light of the above noted amendments and remarks, this application is believed in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is urged to contact applicant's attorney at 503-224-0115 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,



James H. Walters, Reg. No. 35,731

DELLETT AND WALTERS  
Suite 1101  
310 S. W. Fourth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
(503) 224-0115  
DOCKET: S-307

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as first class mail with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 1st day of MARCH, 1999.

